

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/002,005

Applicant(s)

BURKE, JAMES

Examiner

Beniyam Menberu

Art Unit

2626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Beniyam Menberu.

(3) Thomas Schoeffler (43,385).

(2) Kimberly A. Williams.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 September 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kawashima et al. (US 5764371); Liang (US 5867586).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.  
KAW

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
**KIMBERLY WILLIAMS**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Schoeffler pointed out that Liang fails to disclosed the invention as claimed in the proposed amendment and Kawashima marks a page if there is an error, which differs from the claimed invention which confirms that the document is sent. Examiner pointed out col. 7 (fig. 6) of Kawashima which discloses marking regardless of error. Mr. Schoeffler pointed out that the proposed amended claims read over Kawashima in view of Liang (confirming that the document is sent w/ultraviolet marking). Examiner will reconsider the references upon Applicant's filing of response.